

**U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Matthew-Lane: Hassell,  
Plaintiff

V.

Devin Aileen Kimbark  
DOES 1 - X  
Defendant/(s)

**CIVIL ACTION CLAIM FOR DAMAGE(S)**

**Trial by Jury Requested**

**12 Pages**

Matthew-Lane: Hassell, Agent  
45 Falcon Crest Way  
Manchester, New Hampshire {03104}  
(603)231-0844  
[mhas191@yahoo.com](mailto:mhas191@yahoo.com)

Devin Aileen Kimbark  
3 Stoneleigh Dr.  
Derry, New Hampshire 03038  
Phone Number Unknown  
[Dak0292@yahoo.com](mailto:Dak0292@yahoo.com)

**Basis for Jurisdiction:**

To be clear, I do not contest violations of my constitutional rights, I contend agents, posing as government, conspired to deprive me of Prerogative Rights and Unalienable Rights and Natural Rights, in violation of their oath of office, which injured me. They violated their 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment and 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment and 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment and 9<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment contractual government restrictions.

I am bringing forth this CIVIL ACTION CLAIM to go after them in their individual and corporate capacity. How can a government agent do anything, it's a fiction. It relies on the individual to enforce the orders. The corporation insures them not to breach that trust. But it is the individual that decides every action and therefore all agents mentioned are liable on their individual capacity and their corporate capacity. If nothing else the corporations are liable for such claim for damage(s) under Title 15 § 1 and 2 and the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organization Act ( here and after known as

RICO ACT) and Title 42 § 1983 and Title 18 § 3571 Sentence of Fine, for their agents and must surrender those insurance bonds.

In addition to this, they have violated New Hampshire State Constitutional Law to include but not limited to: Art. 2. (and 2-b Right of Privacy) Natural Rights and Article 3. **Society, its Organization and Purposes** and Art. 4. Rights of Conscience Unalienable and Art. 7. State Sovereignty and Art. 15. Right of Accused and Art. 23. Retrospective Laws Prohibited and Art. 33. Excessive Bail, Fines, and Punishments Prohibited, and Article 37. **Separation of Powers** and Art. 84. Oath of Civil Officers.

The 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment and Article 2 and 2-b and 4 and 15 and 33 of the New Hampshire Constitution are being violated by denying me my right to communicate with our daughter. I have a right to speak with her. She has a right to speak with me. These fatherly as well as motherly bonds are stronger and strongest for the first 5 years of the child's life. I have been denied 11 months of visitation and still no access to communicate with my daughter unless I am supervised and then only for 4 hours a week.

I have had my child seized in violation of the agents U.S. Constitution 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment government restriction (and Article 2 and Article 4 and Article 15 and Article 23 and Article 33 and Article 84 of the New Hampshire State Constitution). Show me a warrant signed by a neutral judge and properly sealed by the clerk of the court.

That is the first denial of due process of law, I have had my child seized and I demand all agents cease and desist all of their actions, which violate their oath of office and immediately grant me equal custody and retroactive custody.

The second denial of due process of law and equal protection under the law is, I have had credit(s) seized through the Bureau of Child Support Services. They violated the U.S. Constitution 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment government restriction and Articles 2-b and Article 3 and Article 7 and Article 12 and Article 33 of the New Hampshire State Constitution) and in doing so, I have been denied fair and equal access to my child.

I have been denied fair and equal access to our daughter due to a fraudulent and criminal denial of due process of law, in violation of the judges and possibly others, U.S. Constitution 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment government restriction and Article 2 and Article 3 and Article 4 and Article 7 and Article 15 and Article 23 of the New Hampshire State Constitution. There has been no evidence presented and no proven testimony that any of the charges mentioned by Ms. Kimbark are true. If she had adequately been able to provide the police with charges and evidence to support them, they would have arrested and prosecuted me. Ms. Kimbark made her false claims in a State court without jurisdiction. If she had such evidence, the police would prosecute me. Because none exists, Ms. Kimbark is merely slandering and demeaning my good name, which is libel when printed in court paperwork.

In addition to the aforementioned violations I also include denial of equal protection under the law, in violation of the judges U.S. Constitution 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment government

restriction and Article 15 and Article 33 of the New Hampshire State Constitution. The very first thing a judge should do is order equal custody of any and all minor children until such time as either party withdraws their rights and their interests to the minor child(ren). Again, if there is evidence of any real crimes, Ms. Kimbark and/or her mother (Cheryl Kimbark) and/or her adoptive father (Mark Kimbark) should present such evidence to the proper authorities.

Furthermore, since Ms. Kimbarks parents are harboring her in her acts, they are co-conspirators and liable and culpable.

In addition to this they have violated State Laws to include but not limited to; NH Rev Stat § 643:1 Official Oppression and NH Rev Stat § 626:8 Criminal Liability for Conduct of Another and NH Rev Stat § 626:2 General Requirements of Culpability and NH Rev Stat § 633:2 Criminal Restraint and NH Rev Stat § 633:3 False Imprisonment and NH Rev Stat § 421-A:8 Fraudulent, Deceptive or Manipulative Practices and NH Rev Stat § 641:1 perjury and NH Rev Stat § 641:2 False Swearing and NH Rev Stat § 641:4 False Reports to Law Enforcement.

In addition to the violations of the 1st, 4th, 5th and 14th amendment restriction violations mentioned above, I'll also be adding the 9th Amendment prerogative rights as Phoenix's father for her care and upbringing.

#### **I. Introduction:**

Plaintiff brings this action under the RICO Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968, alleging that Rockingham County and Defendant(s), known and unbeknownst to Plaintiff, has engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity through its Title IV-D child support services, DMV, and related entities, including racketeering activities of fraud, extortion, and conspiracy to commit such acts to include but not limited to any and all other constitutional, federal and state crimes and or violations.

In addition to the RICO Act claim, Plaintiff asserts violations of federal constitutional law for unconstitutional coercion to contract in the attempt of taking of property, deprivation of due process, and equal protection, and for violations to include but not limited to the First and Fourth and Fifth and Ninth and Fourteenth Amendment government restrictions to the U.S. Constitution and the State of New Hampshire Constitution to include but not limited to Article Two and Four and Fifteen and Twenty Three and Thirty Three and Eighty Four.

#### **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

This Court has jurisdiction over this matter under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which confers federal question jurisdiction over cases arising under federal law. This Court also has supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 over Plaintiff's state law claims that are related to Plaintiff's federal claims.

#### **III. FACTS**

1) This matter started on the 12th of November, 2022, when Ms. Kimbark after just three weeks before, having her and my first child, made false and/or misleading claims to her family members Mark and Cheryl Kimbark, who without having any first hand knowledge of any claims being made, involved the City of Manchester Police.

2) Cheryl Kimbark (Ms. Kimbarks mother) claimed to police that, Ms. Kimbark was trying to leave our domicile because of a family disagreement (that included but not limited to Ms. Kimbark may be suffering from postpartum and emotional depression and needed to possibly rest and recover before further disagreement and/or conversation was to proceed) and Ms. Kimbark was unable to leave because her car would not start. Ms. Kimbark claimed that I must have sabotaged her car.

3) Upon police investigation/inspection, no sabotage was found and in fact the vehicle was found to have a dead battery. That would be due to Ms. Kimbarks neglect and/or incompetency. I then assisted Ms. Kimbark in (jumpstarting) her vehicle, while the police watched.

4) Ms. Kimbark proceeded to slander me to the police after her parents filed a false police report against me. It's been more than 10 months, if they had any evidence their claims were true, they would have prosecuted me by now. Ms. Kimbark was possibly having postpartum depression and emotional issues as previously discussed for three weeks, after giving birth to our child on the 22nd of October, 2022.

Comment: Ms. Kimbark is not a

credible witness. She has no physical evidence to support her wild claims and I submit that she is defaming me to gain an upper hand in these custody proceedings. Is she emotionally distraught and therefore incapable of taking care of our child or is she purposely misleading the court, which may be seen as fraud?

5) The original order was issued Ex Parte and therefore, I was denied due process of law and equal protection under the law. I was sick with covid and should have been offered a second chance to be heard, the judge did not exhaust remedy.

6) That is another judicial violation where I was denied due process of law and equal protection under the law. Again, predicated by Ms. Kimbarks written lies and unsubstantiated claims. The judge ordered Ms. Kimbark to have sole decision making and sole residential responsibility and a restraining order against me. This is another account of due process of law and equal protection under the law.

7) In the judges narrative orders (Michael L. Alfano), on the hearing held on the 22nd of March, 2023, the judge gave a statement of jurisdiction without proof of jurisdiction on the record. On multiple occasions the judge has denied me evidentiary hearings.

In accordance with the Social Security act the judge ordered;

i) very little time with my daughter. Two hours supervised visitation on Saturday's and Sunday's;

ii) the judge ordered the highest amount of child support prescribed by law;

iii) the judge continued to show bias and prejudice (additional accounts) when the judge ordered me to drug testing, but did not do the same with Devin;  
iv) the judge has denied due process of law and equal protection under the law multiple times;

Comment: By denying the 5th and 14th amendment to the restrictions of government and its agents and the State of New Hampshire State Constitution Art. 2. Natural Rights and Art. 4. Rights of Conscience Unalienable and Article 7 State Sovereignty and Art. 15. Right of Accused and Art. 23. Retrospective Laws Prohibited and Art. 33. Excessive Bail, Fines, and Punishments Prohibited, and Art. 84. Oath of Civil Officers, would prove a violation to include but not limited to, the New Hampshire Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 1.1 Compliance with the Law and NH Rev Stat § 643:1 Official Oppression and would make the judge criminally liable (NH Rev Stat § 626:8) and culpable (NH Rev Stat § 626:2) in such conspiracy to include but not limited to 18 U.S. Code § 241 - Conspiracy against rights and 18 U.S. Code § 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law, against Petitioner and the fictitious obligations (18 U.S. Code § 514) set upon him, based upon hearsay and perjury claims with no evidence to prove such.  
v) the above further shows bias and prejudice on behalf of the judge.

8) After which, the Bureau of Child Support Services continuously attempted to coerce Petitioner into contract payments over several months. Each and every time a contract was presented to Petitioner, Petitioner did not accept and/or consent to any and all contracts through such commercial entirety. In fact Petitioner sent many mailings over multiple months, explaining he did not accept and/or consent to contract with the Bureau of Child Support Services (to include but not limited to filings in the 10th Circuit- Family District- Derry Court.

9) Petitioner has asked through mailings and phone calls to representatives Mary Rose and/or Betty Raymond, to the Bureau mentioned above for a hearing with the Bureau of Child Support Services, to contest such contract and the legal and lawful ramifications of such fraudulent means of contracting with Petitioner and that I am still waiting on my right to be heard.

10) A NOTICE of DEFAULT to said Bureau was sent on the 21st of June, 2023 to stop such UNLAWFUL COERCION TO CONTRACT and a NOTICE TO CHALLENGE and RESCIND CONTRACT and a NOTICE OF DEFAULT JUDGMENT and PAYMENT (BCSS Case ID: 30154779C).

11) By their silence they have acquiesced. The Bureau of Child Support Services and its agents are equally culpable and liable. To also include but not limited to their extortion and racketeering practices (RICO Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968).

12) The Bureau of Child Support Services ignoring any and all request made by Petitioner and under the guise of a legal and lawful contract, contacted Petitioner's employer and garnished his wages without authority and/or contract with Petitioner, bringing further undue burden of loss(es) upon him and has injured him by such.



13) Following these issues, I have filed multiple motions for evidentiary hearings. On each instance, 3/22/2023 and 4/24/2023 and 5/17/2023 I was contested by Devin through her attorney and have been denied truth in evidence by the judge. Devin is slandering my good name (libel when written) and does not want possible criminal prosecution for such. This is another count of the Judge denying me equal protection under the law.

14) As an officer of the Court, Attorney Jennifer L. DiTrapano and the firm she represents (Germaine & Blaska, P.A.) are equally liable and culpable and for its Fraudulent, Deceptive or Manipulative Practices (NH Rev Stat § 421-A:8) in attempting to coerce and/or conspire in multiple pleadings made through and by Attorney DiTrapano, to force her clients contract payments onto Petitioner.

15) I have entered multiple un rebutted affidavits into the court record. The judge repeatedly ignores them and denies my motions to hear them.

16) Judge Kerry P. Steckowych (the third judge in this matter) has continued with the same constitutional violations as well as biased and prejudiced acts. None of the three judges have proven my challenge of jurisdiction. The judges have not proven they are agents of government (Article III Courthouse judges). The judges did not prove they have a contract or other commercial agreement that obligates me to obey their rules, codes, statutes, regulations or the like. The judges have not proven they have a valid warrant to seize my child. The judges have repeatedly denied me due process of law, in violation of the 5th Amendment restriction. The Judges have repeatedly denied me equal protection under the law in violation of the 14th Amendment restriction.

17) No State judge can decide in favor of either parent without being prejudiced due to the Social Securities Act (as though fully entered herein). The Social Security Act-Title IV-D Section 458-Incentive Payments to States, pays all States and their Judicial subdivisions a percentage of every dollar paid for child support.

18) I have presented this truth to the court and the judge ignored it and did not respond in any medium reasonable under the circumstances. The judge neither addressed the issue nor denied the issue. He just ignored it and proceeded, depriving me of the natural right to my child. This may be seen as deliberate indifference and/or judicial misconduct and/or a fraud upon the court, amongst other crimes, if I am correct.

19) If state judges get paid by the federal government, based on one parent being ordered significantly more time and access to the child, such decisions can only and will always be seen as prejudice therefore, until the Social Security Act is revised, striking such incentives from the record, all decisions ordering disproportionate amounts of child custody (visitation) and any amount of child support awards are void due to constitutional restrictions and violations of canons of law. Specifically the 14th Amendment protection equal protection of the law and Canon of Law 2.2.

20) This matter has been brought to the attention of government agents to include but not limited to Jason on the 30 of June, 2023 around 11:30 am and on or around the

10th of July, 2023 to the Director of the New Hampshire Judicial Branch Administration Office Dianne Martin (both where in the NHJB Administration Office), which also fell upon deaf ears and both have done nothing to uphold their government duties and employment agreement to prevent the further deprivation of rights and government restrictions violations.

21) I attempted to bring this matter to Attorney General John Formella by email on the 9th of July, 2023 and by Certified mail (mailed on the 4th of August, 2023). Attorney General John Formella has not replied by any means reasonable under the circumstances.

22) This matter has been brought to the New Hampshire Judicial Conduct Committee and thus far no relief has been found and/or appears will be had. They have not responded by any means reasonable under the circumstances. Which gives further cause and merit to bring forth this claim and all that encompass(es) for the relief requested be granted.

23) It is a fact that: I am Texas National. I am an inhabitant of New Hampshire. My birth certificate is proof of the first and my Driver's License is proof of the second. Originals available for inspection and verification. These documents prove I am the holder in due course of the trust involved in this controversy as MATTHEW LANE HASSELL.

24) It is a fact that: I do not accept the classification of a UNITED STATES citizen, resident, person, or any other corporate legal fiction.

25) It is a fact that: I expressly reserve all my prerogative rights and unalienable rights and natural rights.

26) It is a fact that: My child support is in legal dispute. All garnishments must CEASE AND DESIST pending results of this dispute. Child support is in violation of the 14th Amendment of the constitution, which guarantees me equal protection under the law. The garnishment has denied me due process of law which is a violation to the 5th Amendment to the constitution.

27) The New Hampshire Health and Human Services - Bureau of Child Support Services have not proven personal and subject and subject matter jurisdiction over me and my person. The child support collection company may be violating the R.I.C.O. Laws and mail fraud and securities fraud laws and bank fraud and depriving rights under color of law (Title 18 241 and 242) as well as the common law and the constitution for the United States of America.

28) Their possible illegal and unlawful (searches,) seizures (and arrests) and other actions are depriving me of my right to tranquility guaranteed by the preamble of, and the rest of the constitution for the United States of America.

I HEREBY RESPECTFULLY ORDER YOU TO CEASE AND DESIST ALL ACTIVITIES AGAINST ME AND MY PERSON until such time as jurisdiction is proven.

#### **IV. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

**Count I – RACKETEER INFLUENCED and CORRUPT ORGANIZATION ACT (here and after known as RICO Act) 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968 Violations to include but not limited to State and Federal Laws.**

Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 28 above.

Defendant(s) and agents, known and unbeknownst, have engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity in violation of the RICO Act, to include but not limited to all hearsay claims made by Attorney Jennifer L. DiTrapano and orders, requests, statements, claims of the records made by Judge Kerry P. Steckowych and/or Michael L. Alfano and/or Judge Todd H. Prevett and/or the Bureau of Child Support Services.

Defendant(s) alleged pattern, of agents, known and unbeknownst to Plaintiff, of racketeering activity includes the commission of the following predicate acts: fraud and bank fraud and securities fraud and extortion and coercion and intimidation and retaliation and conspiracy, to commit such acts.

Defendant(s) alleged pattern, of agents, known and unbeknownst to Plaintiff, of racketeering and extortion activity has caused injury to Plaintiff, in the form of: Trespass(es) of and on his Life and Liberties and pursuit thereof, to include but not limited to: Trespass(es) on Constitutionally Protected Right(s) (Government Restrictions) and Scheduled Fee(s) and Bearer of being under protest and duress in the entirety of this matter since the 12th of November, 2022 to current date and bearer of financial loss(es) and bearer of official Oppression and Criminal Restraint and False Imprisonment and Perjury and Conspiracy and Fraudulent and Deceptive and Manipulative Practices and False Swearing and Criminal Liability for Conduct of Another and General Requirements of Culpability and False Reports to Law Enforcement and Obstruction of Justice and emotional and mental anguish.

Defendant(s) conduct, of agents, known and unbeknownst to Plaintiff, violates the RICO Act, and Plaintiff is entitled to damage(s), including treble damages, retrograde of custodial time, punitive damages, cost(s) and schedule fee(s) under the Rico Act and Titles 18 U.S. Code § 1964 and 18 U.S. Code § 3571 and 15 U.S. Code § 1 and 2.

#### **Count II – Violations of Federal Constitutional Law**

Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 28 above.

Defendant(s) alleged conduct, of agents, known and unbeknownst to Plaintiff, has violated Plaintiff's rights and government restrictions under the First, Fourth, Fifth, and



Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and other Federal and State violations giving cause to Petitioners claim for damage(s) under the Rico Act and Title 15 U.S. Code § 1 and 2 and Title 42 U.S. Code § 1983.

Defendant(s) conduct, of agents, known and unbeknownst to Plaintiff, constitutes an unconstitutional taking of property and deprivation of due process, and denial of equal protection under the law.

Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief and damage(s), including compensatory damage(s) and punitive damage(s) and cost(s) and schedule fee(s), for Defendant(s) and agents, known and unbeknownst to Plaintiff, and for violations of government restrictions of the constitution for the United States of America and the constitution for the State of New Hampshire.

### **Count III - Violations of New Hampshire State Constitutional Law**

Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 28 above.

Defendant(s) conduct, of agents, known and unbeknownst to Plaintiff, has violated New Hampshire State Constitution and New Hampshire State Laws to include but not limited to; Violating Plaintiff's rights and government restrictions under the First and Fourth and Fifth and Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and the New Hampshire State Constitution government restrictions to include but not limited to Art. 2. Natural Rights and Art. 4. Rights of Conscience Unalienable and Art. 7. State Sovereignty and Art. 15. Right of Accused and Art. 23. Retrospective Laws Prohibited and Art. 33. Excessive Bail, Fines, and Punishments Prohibited and Art. 84. Oath of Civil Officers and other Federal and State violations giving merit and cause to Petitioners claim for damage(s) under the Rico Act and Title 15 U.S. Code § 1 and 2 and Title 42 U.S. Code § 1983.

Defendant(s) conduct, of agents, known and unbeknownst to Plaintiff, constitutes an unconstitutional taking of property and deprivation of due process of law and equal protection under the law.

Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief and damage(s), including compensatory damage(s) and punitive damage(s) and cost(s) and schedule fee(s) and for Defendant(s) and agents, known and unbeknownst to Plaintiff, and for violations of government restrictions of the constitution of the United States and the constitution for the State of New Hampshire.

### **SUMMARY:**

In my original parenting plan, I asked for 51/49 Percent Custody and equal protection under the law, which every judge has denied me such and due process of law.

Devin has misrepresented me to the court multiple times and perjured herself and slandered and libeled me, and therefore has injured me.

The best interest for the child seems to be where the state can make the most money from said child in accordance with the Social Security Act as previously cited herein.

The Courts should only decide the best benefit for the child and according to the statistics (child rearing statistics), boys and girls do best with the father, rather than the mother.

Any claim of "immunity" which the government agents could possibly make is a fraud, because if valid, it would prevent removal from office for crimes against the people, which removal is authorized or even mandated under the U.S. Constitution Article 2, Section 4, as well as 18 U.S.C. 241 and 18 U.S.C. 242 and 42 U.S.C. 1983 and 42 U.S.C. 1985 and 42 U.S.C. 1986 and state constitutions as well as the Constitution for the United States of America.

Because they have violated the government restrictions of the U.S. Constitution and the government restrictions of the N.H. State constitution, the government agents do not have immunity under the 11th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

#### **V. REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Petitioner, Matthew-Lane: Hassell, a Propria Persona Sui Juris, respectfully demand and instruct that this Honorable Court order the following relief:

- A. Grant Petitioner immediate 50/50 custodial grantorship of minor child with retroactive custodial parenting time to start immediately;
- B. Order both parties enjoy equal decision making responsibilities of child daycare and school and medical care, etc., and each party is to reimburse the other party for out-of-pocket expenses;
- C. Order an immediate Cease and Desist to the Bureau of Child Support Services wage garnishment and arrearages being sought against Petitioner and return all wages and arrearages unlawfully collected;
- D. Order that no State judge can make any order in family court other than 50/50 equal custody, until the Social Security Act is voided, repealed, canceled;
- E. If either parent/party makes criminal accusations in a family court matter, the accusations must be brought to the proper authorities and ignored by the family court. Until a party is convicted they are entitled to equal protection under the law; Both parties are to be liable to the punishment, if the accused is acquitted, the accuser is sentenced to the same pains and punishments as to what the accused would have been, as prescribed by law;

F. I am requesting an amount in excess of Seventy Five Thousand Dollars;  
 G. Grant Petitioner Punitive and Injunctive and Compensatory Relief Damages and Default of Schedule Fee(s) amount in excess of Seventy Five Thousand Dollars as damages. The 3 Judges (Todd H. Prevett and Michael L. Alfano and Kerry P. Steckowych) shall each be sanctioned with the following violations;

I. For violating their oath of office and employment contract and authority. In failing to defend and protect the U.S. Constitution and the New Hampshire State Constitution and thereby injuring me;

li. For violations of the U.S. Constitution and denying me due process of law (5th Amendment) and equal protection under the law (14th Amendment), I demand their employment bond in the amount of One Million (\$1,000,000.00 U.S.D.) Dollars each, for a total of Three Million (\$3,000,000.00 U.S.D.) dollars;

lii. For violations of New Hampshire State Constitution, Articles 2 Natural Rights and 4 Rights of Conscience Unalienable and 15 Right of Accused, Punitive Damages and Schedule Fees shall be awarded from each judge and in accordance with Title 15 U.S. Code § 1 of One Million (\$ 1,000,000.00 U.S.D.) Dollars each, for a total of Three Million ( \$3,000,000.00 U.S.D.) Dollars;

Iv. For Federal and State Law violations Todd H. Prevett and Michael L. Alfano and Kerry P. Steckowych are to be sanctioned to the full extent of the law as prescribed by Title 15 U.S. Code § 1 and Title 18 § 3571;

- A. NH Rev Stat § 643:1 Official Oppression
- B. NH Rev Stat § 626:8 Criminal Liability for Conduct of Another
- C. NH Rev Stat § 626:2 General Requirements of Culpability
- D. Title 18 U.S. Code § 241
- E. Title 18 U.S. Code § 242
- F. NH Rev Stat § 633:2 Criminal Restraint
- G. NH Rev Stat § 633:3 False Imprisonment

H. Devin Aileen Kimbark is to be sanctioned to the fullest extent of the law as prescribed by Title 18 § 3571;

- I. NH Rev Stat § 633:2 Criminal Restraint
- li. NH Rev Stat § 633:3 False Imprisonment
- lii. NH Rev Stat § 641:1 perjury
- Iv. NH Rev Stat § 641:2 False Swearing
- V. NH Rev Stat § 641:4 False Reports to Law Enforcement
- Vi. NH Rev Stat § 644:11 Criminal Deformation

I. Cheryl Kimbark and Mark Kimbark are to be sanctioned to the fullest extent of the law as prescribed by Title 18 § 3571;

- I. NH Rev Stat § 626:8 Criminal Liability for Conduct of Another
- li. NH Rev Stat § 626:2 General Requirements of Culpability
- lii. NH Rev Stat § 633:2 Criminal Restraint
- Iv. NH Rev Stat § 633:3 False Imprisonment

- V. NH Rev Stat § 641:1 perjury
- Vi. NH Rev Stat § 641:2 False Swearing
- Vii. NH Rev Stat § 641:4 False Reports to Law Enforcement.
- Viii. NH Rev Stat § 644:11 Criminal Deformation

J. Grant any such further relief as justice may require.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that this complaint: (1) is not being presented for an improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation; (2) is supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying or reversing existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for the further investigation or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Rule 11.

VOID WHERE PROHIBITED BY LAW

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED WITHOUT PREJUDICE 1-308

Date: 16<sup>th</sup> of October, 2023

Matthew-Lane Hassell

Matthew-Lane: Hassell authorized agent of  
 MATTHEW LANE HASSELL  
 45 Falcon Crest Way  
 Manchester, New Hampshire [03104]  
 (603) 231-0844  
[mhas191@yahoo.com](mailto:mhas191@yahoo.com)

Platsky v. C.I.A. United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit Nov 24, 1991, 1953 F.2d 26 (2d Cir. 1991). Reversing district court for dismissing pro se complaint for lack of standing without explaining formalities of pleading and affording pro se plaintiff an opportunity to replead.

**Points and Authorities and Legal and Lawful Judicial and Clerical Notice and Definitions to follow this document.**